



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—THE GREEK DICTYS.

The long-standing controversy as to whether or no the Latin *Ephemeris Belli Trojani*, preserved under the name of *Dictys Cretensis* (ed. F. Meister, Teubner, Leipsic, 1872), rests upon a Greek original¹ has at length been settled in the affirmative by the recent discovery of a fragment of the Greek *Dictys*. The fragment in question was found in the winter of 1899–1900 in the Egyptian town of Umm el Baragât (the ancient Tebtunis) on the back of a series of revenue returns dated 206 A. D. and is published by the discoverers in *Tebtunis Papyri* Vol. II, pp. 9 ff., London, 1907. Comparison of the fragment, which is short and badly mutilated, with the corresponding portions of the extant versions of *Dictys* proves beyond a doubt that it forms part of the long-lost² Greek text.³

The annals of *Dictys Cretensis* survive in four mutually independent versions, the Latin *Ephemeris Belli Trojani* of the fourth century A. D.,⁴ and three later Greek versions, embodied in Byzan-

¹ The evenly balanced state of critical opinion upon this much-mooted question finds apt illustration in the equivocal attitude of the early *Dictys* controversialist Gerhardus J. Vossius, who in 1624 spoke out in favor of a Greek *Dictys* (*De Historicis Graecis* III 428), but in the year 1627 retracted his former opinion in the oft-quoted words: "*Quisquis auctor est ejus operis, Latine, non Graece, scripsit*" (*De Historicis Latinis* III 742). From that day to this the history of the *Dictys* controversy presents a succession of alternations between these two extremes. Lehrs (*Wissenschaftliche Monatsblätter* VI 131 ff.) in 1878 and Teuffel in 1890 (*Römische Literatur—Geschichte* II § 423) express themselves as undecided, and in more recent years the elaborate argument brought forward in defense of a Greek *Dictys* in 1892 by F. Noack (*Philologus*, Supplementband VI 402 ff.) failed to convince W. Greif, who in his *Neue Untersuchungen zur Dictys-und-Daresfrage*, Berlin, 1900, attempts to uphold the theory of a Latin *Dictys*. For a more extended review of the history of critical opinion on this subject cf. my *Dares and Dictys*, Baltimore, 1907, p. 18, note 3.

² As early as the fifteenth century, Constantine Lascaris reports that he has searched for the Greek *Dictys* in vain (Gronovius, *Thesaurus* X 1745).

³ Not, however, in all probability, of that text in its original purity (cf. p. 335).

⁴ This date is rendered probable by the style and content of the Latin text; cf. my *Dares and Dictys*, p. 3, note 2.

tine world chronicles, by Joannes Malalas¹ (sixth century), Joannes Antiochenus² (seventh century), and Georgius Cedrenus³ (eleventh century), respectively. It is my present purpose to inquire what light the newly discovered fragment sheds upon the relation of these versions to their original and to one another.

To begin with the Latin Ephemeris. The Greek fragment proves, in the first place, that a certain Lucius Septimius, who, in an epistle prefixed to the Latin text, claims that he has translated the ensuing annals of Dictys from the Greek (Meister, p. 1, l. 16), was not, as the advocates of a Latin Dictys had maintained, the author of these annals,⁴ but, as he himself declares, merely the translator of an earlier work written in Greek.⁵

In the second place, the fragment accurately bears out a further assertion made by Septimius in his epistle with regard to the

¹ Malalas' version of Dictys occupies the greater portion of the fifth book of his *Χρονογραφία*. The *Χρονογραφία* no longer survives in its original form but is represented by two condensed transcripts, one, of practically the entire history, in an Oxford MS, edited by Dindorf in Niebuhr, Corp. Script. Hist. Byz., Bonn, 1831, and the other, of the history of Dictys merely, in a Paris MS entitled *Ἐκλογὴ ἱστοριῶν*, edited by Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca* II 197-227, Oxford, 1839 (cf. my *Dares and Dictys*, pp. 36, 45 ff.).

² John of Antioch's version of Dictys is preserved in three sets of fragments: (1) the Constantine fragments, ed. Cramer, *Anecd. Paris*, 1839, II 4, l. 3-5, l. 13, and C. Mueller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, 1851, IV 550, fr. 23, 551, fr. 25; (2) the Salmasian fragments, ed. Cramer II 390 ff., and Mueller, p. 550, fr. 24; and (3) certain fragments embedded in the chronicle of John of Sicily, ed. H. Heinrich, *Die Chronik des Johannes Sikeliota*, Graz, 1892, pp. 8-10.

³ Cedrenus' version of Dictys is contained in his *Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν*, ed. Bekker in Niebuhr, op. cit., Bonn, 1838.

⁴ Thus Dunger (*Dictys-Septimius*, Berlin, 1878, p. 3, note 2) and Greif (op. cit., pp. 5-7) contend that the claim of translation from the Greek was contrived by Septimius merely as a blind in order to disguise his own authorship of annals which he has already ascribed (epis., ed. Meister, p. 1, ll. 1-14) to the eye-witness Dictys.

⁵ The recovery of the fragment thus confirms the validity of the argument that a forged history of the Trojan war is to be looked upon rather as the product of the inventive Greek than of the practical Roman mind (cf. Gudeman, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* XXV 150 ff.), particularly in view of the fact that the names of other authors (real or imaginary) to whom Trojan annals have been attributed—as Dares the Phrygian by Ptolemaeus Chennus (*Καὶνὴ ἱστορία*, ed. from Photius by Roulez, p. 147 a 24), Syagrius by Aelian (*Varia Historia* XIV 21), Sisyphus of Cos and Phidalius of Corinth by Malalas (ed. Bekker, op. cit., p. 117, ll. 1 and 14), Palamedes and Corinnus the Ilian by Suidas (*Lexicon* s. v.)—are, in every case, Greek (cf. my *Dares and Dictys*, pp. 108-109). The fragment moreover

manner in which he performed his task of translation. This he describes as follows: nobis cum in manus forte libelli venissent, avidos verae historiae cupido incescit ea uti erant Latine disserere, non magis confisi ingenio, quam ut otiosi animi desidiâ discuteremus (Meister, p. 1, ll. 14-18). If now, taking the words "uti erant Latine disserere" to mean a loose paraphrase as distinguished from a literal translation,¹ we compare the claim of Septimius with his actual practice, we find that he is, as a matter of fact, at constant pains to expand the wording of his original. Thus he renders the Greek: πένθος δὲ οὐ μικρὸν τοῖς ἐν Ἰλίῳ ἐγένετο Τρωϊλοῦ ἀπολομένου. ἦν γὰρ ἔτι νέος καὶ γενναῖος καὶ [ῥαῖος²] (Tebtunis Papyri II, p. 12, l. 12—p. 13, l. 14) by the Latin Troiani tollunt gemitus et clamore lugubri Troili casum miserandum in modum deflent recordati aetatem eius admodum immaturam, qui in primis pueritiae annis cum verecundia ac probitate, tam praecipue forma corporis amabilis atque acceptus popularibus adolescebat (Meister, p. 76, ll. 9-14). The foregoing passage further reveals the groundlessness of the attempt of the advocates of a Latin Dictys to find in the frequent and indubitable instances in Septimius of phrasal indebtedness to earlier Latin authors³ evidence that the Ephemeris could not have been a translation.⁴ For the expression "qui in primis pueritiae annis cum verecundia ac probitate, tam praecipue forma corporis amabilis atque acceptus popularibus adolescebat", which is cited by Pratje⁵ as an ex-

creates an initial presumption in favor of regarding the Trojan annals of Dares the Phrygian, which, like those of Dictys, claim to come from the Greek, but survive only in Latin form, as, in like manner, derived from an earlier Greek prototype.

¹ Cf. E. Patzig, *Dictys Cretensis*, Byz. Zs. I 151.

² Apparently to be supplied in the fragment, which is here blank, from Malalas (Mal. 130, 5), as shown by the Latin forma corporis.

³ Chiefly from Sallust, Virgil, and Cicero; cf. Pratje, 1874, *Quaestiones Sallustianae*, passim; Lehrs, 1878, *op. cit.*, pp. 137 ff.; Brunnert, 1883, *Sallust u. Dictys Cretensis*, passim; Dunger, 1886, *De Dictys-Septimio Virgilii imitatore*, passim; Teuffel, 1890, *loc. cit.*; Noack, 1892, *op. cit.*, pp. 451 ff.; and Griffin, 1907, *op. cit.*, pp. 114 ff.

⁴ Cf. Joly, 1870, *Benoît de Ste. More et le Roman de Troie* II 185 ff.; Meister, 1872, *preface to edition of Dictys*, pp. viii-x; Dunger, 1878, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 ff.; Wagner, 1880, *Jahns' Jahrbuch*. CXXXVI 509 ff.; and Greif, 1885, *Die mittelalterl. Bearb. der Trojasage*, p. 4 and, 1886, the continuation of the same in Stengel's *Ausgabe u. Abhandlungen* LXI 245 ff.

⁵ Who compares (*Quaest. Sallust.*, pp. 10 and 22) the Sallustian phrases *ita inter artis bonas integrum ingenium brevi adolevit* (Jug. 64, 5) and *tam acceptum popularibus* (Jug. 7, 1).

ample of the mannered phraseology of Sallust, is, at the same time, as we have seen, nothing more nor less than a free translation of the Greek, *ἦν γὰρ ἔτι νέος καὶ γενναῖος καὶ [ὥραῖος]*. It is, accordingly, evident that Septimius uses these borrowed phrases merely as a means of elaborating his original and that it is this method of amplification by imitation to which the words "ut erant Latine disserere" unquestionably refer.

Finally, the vindication afforded by the Greek fragment of Septimius' assertions with regard to the fact and manner of his translation predisposes us to accept as likewise true his final assertion, at the end of the epistle, to the effect that he has, in his translation, retained the first five books of his original intact, but has condensed the last five, which treat of the Return of the Greeks, into one (Meister, p. 1, ll. 18-20). Now, unfortunately, the truth of this last assertion cannot be tested by reference to the Greek fragment, which ends before the opening of the *Νόστοι*. But since the account of the Return of the Greeks is actually found to occupy the sixth book of the Latin text and since the version there given of this event is, as compared with the Byzantine versions, brief and full of evident omissions,¹ we may safely conclude that here again Septimius' assertion is to be taken at its face value and that the sixth and last book of the Latin text represents, as he declares, an epitome of the last five books of the Greek original.

I pass now to the earliest of the Byzantine versions, that by Joannes Malalas. The Greek fragment proves, in the first place, that the sixth century Malalas did not, as the advocates of a Latin Dictys have contended, derive his version of Dictys from the Latin of the fourth century Septimius.² For, to use a passage already familiar, it is manifestly impossible to regard Malalas' description of Troilus, *ἦν γὰρ ἔτι νέος καὶ γενναῖος καὶ ὥραῖος* (Mal. 130, 5) as a translation of the amplified Latin, *recordati aetatem adolescebat* when Malalas' words are precisely identical with those of the Greek fragment (cf. p. 331). On the contrary, it becomes at once clear that Malalas must have derived his version of Dictys either directly or indirectly from the Greek original.

¹ Cf. my Dares and Dictys, pp. 111 ff.

² Cf. Joly, 1870, op. cit., I 193 ff.; Dunger, 1878, op. cit., pp. 12 ff.; Haupt, 1881, Dares, Malalas, u. Sisypheus, Philologus XL 107 ff.; Greif, 1886, op. cit., pp. 173 ff.

The Greek fragment shows, in the second place, that the immediate source of Malalas was not, in all probability, the Greek original, but, as already maintained by Noack and myself,¹ an intermediary redaction, and this for the following reasons. Malalas' version of *Dictys* possesses two marked features absent in Septimius and in the later Byzantine versions. The two features thus peculiar to Malalas are (1) three distinct references to a certain Sisyphus of Cos as authority for events which in all other versions of *Dictys* are related as a regular portion of the *Dictys* recital² and (2) two curiously contrived dialogues wherein Malalas relates in dramatic style (first person) the very same war narrative which in all other versions of *Dictys* is related in straightforward narrative style (third person).³ Now since these three Sisyphus citations and these two dialogues occur only in Malalas and since, furthermore, the third citation introduces Sisyphus as authority for the contents of the second dialogue,⁴ it is obviously natural to associate this second dialogue⁵ with Sisyphus and to regard the three Sisyphus citations and the second dialogue

¹ Noack, *op. cit.*, pp. 439 ff.; Griffin, *op. cit.*, pp. 77 ff.

² The events for which Sisyphus is cited as authority by Malalas are, first (Mal. 117, 1; Ekl. 209, 30), the adventures of Ulysses with the Cyclops (Mal. 114, 18-116, 23; Ekl. 208, 16-209, 31), related, without reference to Sisyphus, by Septimius (Eph. VI 5) and Cedrenus (232, 17-21); secondly (Mal. 119, 22; Ekl. 212, 7), the adventures of Ulysses with Circe (Mal. 117, 17-119, 22; Ekl. 210, 15-212, 16), again related without reference to Sisyphus by Septimius (Eph. VI 6), John of Antioch (Salm. fr. 24, 10) and Cedrenus (232, 21-23); and, thirdly (Mal. 132, 19; Ekl. 221, 16), the contents of the dialogue between Teucer and Pyrrhus (Mal. 122, 17-132, 16; Ekl. 216, 19-221, 24), related in narrative form and still without reference to Sisyphus by Septimius (Eph. III 1-IV 13), John of Antioch (Sik. 7, 18-9, 5), and Cedrenus (223, 14-228, 16).

³ The contents of the first of these two dialogues (Mal. 109, 16-114, 1; Ekl. 205, 8-207, 30), which takes place between Ulysses and Ajax Telamon, is related in narrative style by Septimius (Eph. IV 20-21; V 7-13), John of Antioch (Sik. 9, 9-10, 25) and Cedrenus (228, 16-232, 2); of the second (Mal. 122, 17-132, 16; Ekl. 216, 19-221, 24), in which Teucer and Pyrrhus are the participants, by Septimius (Eph. III 1-IV 13), John of Antioch (Sik. 7, 18-9, 5), and Cedrenus (223, 14-228, 16).

⁴ Cf. note 1.

⁵ Presumably not, however, the first dialogue, which not only stands under no Sisyphus citation, but is already present in embryo in the Dictaeon debate between Ajax Telamon and Ulysses as to who shall possess the Palladium in Septimius (Eph. V 14), John of Antioch (Sik. 10, 16-17), and Cedrenus (232, 3-8).

as constituting evidence of the remains in Malalas of a second Trojan chronicle, distinct from the Dictys chronicle, which we may term the Sisyphus chronicle. Save for these two Sisyphus elements Malalas derived his Troica solely from Dictys whom he cites repeatedly.¹ The question accordingly arises whence did Malalas obtain this peculiar Sisyphus matter which stands in such striking contrast to the Dictys matter in which it is embedded. Now it is hardly to be supposed that Malalas, who, as the author of a world chronicle, was not, of course, primarily concerned with the story of Troy, would have taken the pains to consult two separate chronicles for materials which constitute so small a portion of his entire work.² It is much more probable, on the contrary, that he found both his Dictys and his Sisyphus materials already combined in one and the same source. But this source could not have been the Greek Dictys. For the newly discovered fragment, which happens, fortunately, to open with those two events which form the conclusion of Malalas' second dialogue: viz., the deaths of Troilus and of Achilles (Tebtunis Papyri, p. 12, l. 1—p. 14, l. 53; Mal. 129,19–132,4; Ekl. 220,3–221,14), relates these events, not in the dramatic form used by Malalas, but, as we should expect, in the same straightforward narrative style used in all other versions of Dictys. Hence it appears in all respects probable that Malalas derived his Troica from a redaction of Dictys in which the narrative form of the original recital had already become in part displaced by the dramatic form of the Sisyphus recital.

But little additional light is shed by the Greek fragment upon the version of Dictys by John of Antioch, and none whatsoever upon that by Cedrenus. In one instance the fragment appears to confirm the view³ that Antioch derived his version of Dictys neither from Septimius,⁴ nor from Malalas,⁵ nor from the two combined,⁶

¹ Eight times (Mal. 107,1; Ekl. 201,28; Mal. 119,23, Ekl. 212,7; Mal. 122,2, Ekl. 213,11; Ekl. 216,5; Mal. 132,22, Ekl. 221,19; Mal. 135,12; Mal. 250,2).

² Malalas' Troica occupy only a portion of one of the seventeen books into which the *Xρονολογία* is divided (cf. p. 330, note 1).

³ Held by Noack, 1892, op. cit., pp. 482 ff.; Gleye, 1896, Byz. Zs. V 451 ff.; and Griffin, op. cit., pp. 86 ff.

⁴ Because he shares with Malalas certain particulars absent in Septimius (cf. Griffin, pp. 83–4).

⁵ Because he shares with Septimius other particulars not found in Malalas (cf. Griffin, pp. 84–5).

⁶ For he exhibits a third set of particulars found in neither one of his predecessors (Griffin, pp. 86–9).

but from the original Dictys.¹ For the occurrence of the word νεκρούς (Tebtunis Papyri 13, 17) in a deleted portion of the fragment renders it altogether probable that Antioch's corresponding statement (Sik. 8, 21), absent alike in Septimius and Malalas, that the Trojans desired to burn their dead (νεκρούς) stood in the Greek Dictys.²

As regards, finally, the bearing of the Greek fragment upon the relation between the prologue and the epistle of the Latin Ephemeris, it is probable that the prologue, which relates in detail the story of the discovery and subsequent preservation of the annals of the Cretan soldier Dictys (Meister, pp. 2-3) was invented by the unknown author of the Greek Dictys to serve as preface to that text and that the brief recapitulation of that story in the epistle (Meister, p. 1, ll. 1-14) was afterwards added by Septimius as a translator's preface. As to the date of composition of the Greek text, occasional variations in the fragment from what we must suppose to have been the original form of Dictys' memoirs³ serve to corroborate the generally accepted view that the Dictys fiction was composed soon after the reign of Nero.⁴ For these variations might readily have appeared within the considerable interval which would then have elapsed between the original date of composition and the early third century, to which, on the basis of the papyrus, which is dated 206, the fragment is assigned by the editors (p. 10).

NATHANIEL E. GRIFFIN.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

¹ Cf. Griffin, pp. 86 ff.

² As conjectured by the editors (p. 16), without consulting John of Antioch.

³ That the statement, for example, that Deiphobus, as well as Paris (T. P. 12, 5), led the Trojans to battle must have stood in the original Greek is evident from the concurrence of Malalas (Mal. 129, 21; Ekl. 220, 5), Cedrenus (227, 5), and Septimius ("Alexander cum reliquis fratribus", p. 75, l. 29). The passage is omitted in the Antioch excerpts.

⁴ Cf. Gudeman, op. cit., p. 152; Tebtunis Papyri, p. 10.